

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 9-19 and 21 are canceled; claims 29-36 are added; and claims 1-8, 20, and 22-28 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 20, and 22-36 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 2-8 and 23-25 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the office action, claims 1-8, 20, and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,327) in view of Bezos (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied-on references.

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended in the manner discussed with the Examiner on April 10, 2008. Neither the relied-on sections of Klug nor the relied-on sections of Bezos disclose or suggest the features that are newly added to claims 1 and 20.

It follows that, for at least these reasons, neither the relied-on sections of Klug nor the relied-on sections of Bezos, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the system defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Moreover, for at least the above reasons, neither the relied-on sections of Klug nor the relied-on sections of Bezos, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the method defined in claim 20, and claim 20 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied-on references.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and claims 22-28 depend from claim 20. Therefore, each of claims 2-8 and 22-28 is

distinguishable over the relied-on references at least for the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New claims 26-30 depend from claim 1, and new claims 31-36 depend from claim 20. Each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Klug and Bezos for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 29-36 is found, e.g., in Figs. 3 and 4 and on pages 15-22 of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant